

# SCRIPTURE

THE QUARTERLY OF THE CATHOLIC BIBLICAL ASSOCIATION

---

VOL. IV. No. 8

OCTOBER 1950

---

## EDITORIAL

During May it was my privilege to be able to make a Jubilee visit to Rome and it seemed opportune to profit by the occasion to obtain a special Blessing from the Holy Father for our Association. A volume of *SCRIPTURE* was bound in white silk to be presented to the Holy Father. Owing to the extremely full programme of His Holiness during that month it was not possible at such short notice to obtain a private audience, and the volume was given to someone else who undertook to present it to the Pope as soon as possible. This was done, and in due course the following gracious letter from the Vatican was received :—

*Segreteria di Stato  
di Sua Santità*

DAL VATICANO,  
11th July 1950

Dear Father Fuller,

At the August bidding of the Sovereign Pontiff, I am to acknowledge receipt of the volume entitled *SCRIPTURE*, the Quarterly of the Catholic Biblical Association, which you so graciously presented to Him a short time ago.

The Holy Father is very appreciative of the spirit of devoted homage and attachment which animated you in making this book available to Him, and He has bade me convey to you His expression of heartfelt gratitude. It was a source of pleasure and satisfaction for His Holiness to note the great zeal with which the members of the Catholic Biblical Association are labouring to instill a greater love and appreciation for the word of God in the hearts of all men.

With an earnest prayer that our Divine Lord may prosper all the efforts and activities of your Association, the Holy Father affectionately bestows upon you and upon all who are associated with you in this work, His special Apostolic Benediction.

With sentiments of esteem and cordial regard, I am,

Sincerely yours in Christ,

(Signed) J. B. MONTINI,  
*Subst.*

*Lectures.* Following on the course of Biblical lectures by Dr Leahy which ended last spring, we have a further series by the same lecturer, starting 6th October. The lectures are every Friday from 6.30 to 8.15 at the Newman Association, 31 Portman Square, London, W.1. This time Dr Leahy has chosen the Old Testament as his subject. The course covers a wide field and is intended to be a comprehensive introduction to the Old Testament aiming at giving some acquaintance with a selected number of its Books. It is hoped that the course will encourage people to read the Old Testament with greater attention and interest. The fee for the whole course of twenty-four lectures is £1 10s. 0d. Members of the Newman and Catholic Biblical Associations are charged £1 for the course. Full time students, 10s. All applications should be made to the Registrar, Newman Association, 31 Portman Square, W.1. Telephone: Welbeck 9958.

*Lending Library.* After a year of homelessness, this library has now been housed at the Newman Association and it is hoped that it will be in working order in a very short time. Terms of borrowing will be as before until further notice. Application for books should be made to the C.B.A. Librarian, Newman Association, 31 Portman Square, London, W.1.

## THE ESCHATOLOGY OF THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS<sup>1</sup>

### INTRODUCTORY

**I**F the subject which we have chosen is dry it may be some consolation for you to know that it is fashionable; we might even say that it is all the rage. But this would be small comfort for a serious assembly were it not that the topic is also of some moment. I should say of the greatest moment. It is inseparable from the fundamental question of the Kingdom of God. As you know, the establishment of the kingdom of God was the whole purpose of Christ's coming. Not the partial purpose but the whole purpose. Now this notion of the Kingdom is complex, and the complexity is not the result of our speculation, it is forced upon us by the plain meaning of a series of texts—of texts whose authenticity cannot reasonably be called in doubt. It follows that there are many avenues leading to this many-sided thing, affording us a prospect of some wing of it. Of these, eschatology is one and not the least.

Now that we have used the ugly word 'eschatology' we must say what we mean by it in order to avoid all confusion and, which comes

<sup>1</sup> A paper read at the Conference of Ecclesiastical Studies, held at Campion Hall, Oxford, during Easter Week, 1950.

to the same thing, unnecessary discussion. Eschatology is the doctrine of the Last Things; or better still the doctrine of the Latter Things. Now by 'last things' we do not mean what are commonly called the 'four last things'—death, judgement, hell, heaven; these are included in but do not exhaust the term. I mean everything that lies on the horizon and we must remember that the horizon is something relative—it recedes as we advance. To distinguish these different termini of perspective the adjectives 'absolute' and 'relative' are commonly used but for the sake of clarity we shall avoid them. We prefer to distinguish Historical from Cosmic eschatology. By Cosmic eschatology I mean teaching which has for its subject what is commonly called the End of the World and the state of things which is to follow this universal collapse. By Historical eschatology I mean teaching concerning the end of one era and the beginning of a new. When speaking of the New Testament we may subdivide what we have called Historical eschatology into Present and Proximate; present and proximate, that is, from the point of view of the New Testament writers. The subject of what we call Present Historical eschatology is the person of Christ himself; it has been well called 'realized' eschatology: our Lord marks the drawing to an end of an old era and the beginning of a new; indeed he *is* that end and that beginning. Proximate Historical eschatology deals with the public and final collapse of the old order (the Destruction of Jerusalem and its Temple) and the consequent emergence of the new order, which we call Christianity, as an independent entity. We may regard this as the *nativity* of Christianity which was already *incarnate* in Christ.

#### OLD TESTAMENT ESCHATOLOGY

It is evident, given this comprehensive description of eschatology, that we cannot say with Guy in his recent book that 'no great prominence is given to eschatology in the Old Testament'. This is an undue and inconsistent restriction of the term. It is more accurate to say that there is no clear cosmic eschatology in the prophets, that the 'woe' and 'bliss' sequence, so common in prophetic literature, does not refer to Hell and Heaven but to a sequence in earthly history. The eschatology of the prophets is historical. It could scarcely be otherwise at a time when revelation of a future life, in any full sense of the word, was still withheld. This observation must also be borne in mind when we consider the stereotyped prophetic phrases: the 'End of Days' or the 'Day of Yahweh'. The former means simply the final phase of history so far as the speaker's perspective reaches. The 'Day of Yahweh' denotes the same from a different point of view—it is the great day when God himself takes a notable hand in historical events to bring an era to its close. There may be many such Days because, as we have said, the

perspective shifts. For Amos (viii, 9) the fall of Samaria in 721 is no doubt the Day; for Jeremias the defeat of Egypt at Karkemish in 609; in Lamentations the fall of Jerusalem in 586 (Jer. xlvii, 10; Lam. i, 12); in the last of the prophets it is the great day of religious revival when the Lord himself comes to his temple to take its worship in hand. (Mal iii.) We need not expect from the prophets, therefore, what we have called cosmic eschatology. They deal not with the end of *the* world but with the end of *a* world, the end of an era. In a text which few critics would care to call in question and to which we shall return later, St Peter shows the legitimacy and traditional character of this interpretation. For him the life, death, resurrection, apotheosis of his Master and the effusion of his Spirit prove that the 'last days' spoken of by Joel have already dawned:

This is that which was spoken of by Joel the prophet:

It shall come to pass *in the last days*, saith the Lord, that I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh (Acts ii, 16 ff).

The 'last days' are therefore the final stage of world-history; nothing is said of their duration either in the Old or in the New Testament. Of this historical eschatology the prophets are full. The prophets were, of course, in the familiar cliché, rather forthtellers than foretellers but their forthtelling, their preaching, persistently invokes promises, encouragements, threats of God's decisive intervention in the future.

It is important to underline this statement that the genuine prophetic expectation is focused on this world and not on the next. It is true that certain pre-Christian apocalypses are affected profoundly by the hopelessness of their position, oppressed as the Jews were by the Romans. The author of the *Assumption of Moses* for instance (40 bc) turns his messianic thought to the hope of a new creation built on the ruins of the old. But this is a deviation from the original hopes. There is no doubt, that the prophets expect a kingdom on this earth. One need not, and should not, invoke the material and adventitious imagery which lies on the fringe of their mentality but there is a substantial and persistent tradition attaching to the Davidic dynasty which cannot be ignored. The evangelists themselves are not troubled when they cannot prove that their crucified master has crushed his enemies like a potter's vessel or rules with a rod of iron or makes his foes his footstool but neither Matthew nor Luke thinks it prudent to omit the Davidic genealogy of Jesus. Now a Davidic king implies an earthly kingdom and this, therefore, the prophets expected. Theirs was not the transcendental messianism of the *Assumption of Moses*.

#### DANIEL

But we should like to deal a little more fully with a text that lies (in its present form) at the end of the long messianic tradition. This

for two reasons: partly because it demonstrates the temporal nature of the expected Age, partly because it is a text of the greatest significance for the understanding of certain New Testament texts which we shall call upon later.

Using the huge canvas of apocalyptic, Daniel paints four hundred years of the history of his people; in placard-fashion he presents the successive suzerainty of Babylon, Persia, Greece and Syria. Each empire has its banner: Lion, Bear, Leopard, Dragon. But when the Ancient of Days, or the one crowned with age as Knox has it, assumes his judicial throne all these empires pass, cut off in mid-career by divine judgement. And then, the prophet continues:

I beheld till thrones were placed and the Ancient of Days sat . . . and lo! one like a son of man came with (or 'upon') the clouds of heaven and came up to the Ancient and was presented to him. And he was given power and glory and royal rank and all peoples, nations and tongues were his subjects. His power is an everlasting power never to be taken from him and his kingship a kingship never to be destroyed (Dan. vii, 9-14).

It seems clear that this kingdom, is, like those it supplants, a kingdom on this earth. Its symbol is not a brute rising, like the four, from the abyss; it is a mysterious human shape, human in origin (as the phrase 'son of man' suggests) and yet one whose investiture is in heaven. The banner of the new kingdom is not Lion or Bear but Man—though the prophet did not guess that it might be a man nailed to a cross. Now in view of what we have to say it should be carefully noted that the 'coming with the clouds' is not a coming to earth but a coming to the Ancient of Days. We are dealing with a vision and the vision is in another dimension; the coming is symbolic and horizontal not physical and vertical; the one like a son of man comes to the Ancient of Days for investiture not to the earth for judgement.

#### DANIEL AND THE NEW TESTAMENT

This remark brings us to a most portentous eschatological sentence of the New Testament. It occurs in the eschatological discourse itself and in the Trial before Caiaphas: we shall shortly make the modest but unusual claim that it is to be understood in the same way in each. I refer to the words of our Lord before the Council. Our Lord promised the Sanhedrists that very soon indeed (*ap'arti*: Matt. *apo tou nun*: Luke) they would see the son of man coming in the clouds of heaven. The Sanhedrists understood the style of apocalyptic well enough; they understood Daniel well enough to know that he spoke not of a sudden and catastrophic apparition in the heavens but of the establishment of that kingdom of God whose sign, or rather whose personification and as it were incarnation, was a son of man. They understood, more-

over, the enormous claim that lay in his calm assumption of the title 'son of man'. Our Lord's clear meaning is that, despite present mean appearances, it will very shortly be seen that he is in fact the sign and centre of Daniel's kingdom. That the reference is not to a single dramatic event is further underlined by the otherwise strange phrase used in Matt. *Henceforth* you shall see . . . which suggests not a single experience but an insistent and permanent impression.

We shall return to this Gospel text in another setting in a few moments but we have introduced it here first because it is inseparable from the Daniel prophecy and secondly because it prepares us for an eschatology connected not with heaven in the transcendental sense but with a heaven on earth which is the Kingdom of the Saints, as it is called in Daniel. Converging on this same notion are a number of biblical *rapprochements* at which we can only hint here. There is the interesting series of Temple texts, for instance, our Lord himself suggests a new era on earth—an era of the Gentiles counterbalancing the old era of Judaism. Indeed this very issue is raised at the Trial and there was some truth in what the false witnesses alleged. In fact our Lord had spoken of the temple of his body, of his risen body, but it was quite clear even to the public that the passing of the old order would not disturb him because he claimed the power to set up a new. This claim provokes the indignant question of the high priest: Art thou the Son of God? In reply, our Lord does not impeach the witnesses; rather he insists that he is the centre of the new messianic era prophesied by Daniel. In this sense, as he said elsewhere, he is greater than the Temple.

It is possible, too, that the odd title 'Son of Man' contains more than is usually thought. The second part of Isaias had already looked forward to the new age as to a new creation, a *palingenesia* as our Lord calls it. Now the term son of Man (*ben adam*) itself perhaps suggests this same notion—the 'second Adam' of St Paul is possibly no more than a development of our Lord's own idea. But whatever be doubtful about the detail of such texts it seems indubitable that our Lord contemplates a coming epoch in which worship is centred not on this mountain or on that but upon his own person. With his advent, therefore, the focus of worship changes. With the coming of Christ in person a new era has already dawned. This, in the phrase associated with Prof. Dodd of Cambridge, is what is meant by 'realized eschatology'; it is what we have called 'historical present' eschatology.

#### GOSPEL TEXTS

It is now time to pass to the Gospel texts which deal more explicitly with this 'present' or 'realized' eschatology in terms of the coming of the Kingdom. We have said that a sense of inconclusiveness and of



expectation is characteristic of the Old Testament as a whole. The New Testament has a very different outlook—its writers regard it as an era of fulfilment, an era in which the Kingdom of God stands revealed. We shall review one or two texts which emphasize this view of history. In this we shall find, no doubt, a powerful antidote for two diseases of Gospel criticism. The first is the out-and-out eschatology, exclusively cosmic eschatology, of which Schweitzer is the outstanding representative. He holds that our Lord expected the end of the world and his own glorious return in the lifetime of his disciples. The second is equally extreme. It claims that Jesus was not at all concerned with another world but only with the ethical improvement of this. The 'kingdom of God' is merely a world reformed in moral conduct. Against the former view we shall see that cosmic eschatology, far from being the obsession of our Lord's teaching plays, in reality, a relatively small part in it. Indeed, even apart from the formal texts this hypothesis is unacceptable. It ignores the passages which make it clear that Christ's intention was to found a society with constituted authorities and a defined programme; it takes no account of the parables which show the kingdom as a gradually growing thing, not as a catastrophic imposition from heaven; it forgets that the Sermon on the Mount cannot be described as a prescription for what it calls 'interim ethics' to fill in the short period between Christ's death and the imminent End; the Sermon holds no hint of an imminent parousia but legislates clearly for a world which goes on in the same old way. But against the opposite extreme of error, the merely ethical view of our Lord's ministry, it will become apparent that even cosmic eschatology plays some part but that historical eschatology plays a very great part indeed. The texts will show that, with the coming of Christ came not only a new stimulus to ethical action but something substantial and new, almost alien to the world: a spiritual yet physical force which our Lord calls the Kingdom of God. The coming of this kingdom is a gratuitous divine intervention independent of the good or bad actions of men. It is at once a grace which re-creates the world and a domain into which man is invited to enter.

There is no doubt that the advent of this Kingdom was the very core of our Lord's teaching. The imprisonment of the Baptist spelt the end of the old régime, because 'the Law and the Prophets were until John and from that time the Kingdom was preached'. 'After John was delivered up', says Mark significantly, 'Jesus came into Galilee preaching the good news from God and saying: The time is accomplished and the kingdom of God is at hand'. As many commentators have pointed out, the term 'at hand' (*eggiken*) is equivalent to 'is here'—we need invoke no further arguments than the phrase 'the time is fulfilled' which precedes. From another source equally unassailable (call it 'Q' if you like) the disappearance of the Baptist from the scene is given the same

significance. Jesus informs the embassy, sent by the imprisoned John, that the Messiah is in their midst; he uses terms that Isaiah had reserved for the 'day of the Lord' and 'the year of the recompense of Sion' (Isaiah xxxiv, 8 cf. xxxv, 5 ff). As for the Baptist himself he is the last word of law and prophets; a new age has dawned in which prophecy has no part. The Kingdom is there for the taking if one has the energy for its conquest. Indeed, already 'the kingdom of the heavens is being stormed and the stormers are capturing it' (Matt. xi, 12). Many a prophet had looked to this fulfilment and many a Davidic king had dreamt of such a perfect kingdom but the circle gathered round Jesus had the joy of seeing it (Matt. xiii, 16 ff). The kingdom was already present in the royal power exercised by our Lord through the seventy-two. He saw in their success the end of the old empire, its king falling like lightning from heaven (Luke x, 18). He claimed it as the clear conclusion from his own exorcisms (Matt. xii, 28): 'But if I by the finger of God cast out devils, why then the kingdom of God has come to you'. The Greek phrase used here (*ephthasen humas*) is that of Daniel vii, 22 (Theodotion). When the authenticity of this text of 'Q' is called in question we have the right to object that an *a priori* synthesis is being imposed upon the evidence.

There is another text which, though it does not mention the present Kingdom in so many words nevertheless indicates just as clearly that our Lord's emphasis is on fulfilment; it may also serve to remove an impression of cosmic eschatology standing where it ought not. You will remember that after the Transfiguration the appearance and disappearance of Elias had been troubling the apostles. Elias had appeared after our Lord and had disappeared without furthering his mission in any way. This was not the Elias, herald of the Messiah, described by the Scribes from their reading of Malachy (iv, 5-6). Our Lord grants their expression but not their perspective. This herald, Elias, he says, has already come—in the person of the Baptist. Now Malachy had declared that this coming was to precede the great Day of the Lord; the great Day must therefore have arrived already. Our Lord clarifies every aspect of the prophetic hope and here he clarifies its obscure eschatology. In face of the limited horizon of the prophets and in face of this text it would seem rash to speak of a return of Elias in person before the day of final judgment. Nevertheless, this is an independent question and all would at least agree that our Lord implies that the messianic kingdom has indeed arrived. The 'latter days', or 'the end of days', to use the common prophetic phrase, is now in Christ's time an accomplished reality.

Whatever the difficulties of other texts we must not loosen our hold on this conclusion. When other passages speak of the kingdom yet to come the logical inference will be that the kingdom and its coming



are complex notions. This complexity is well known to us though we rarely analyse it. Every day we pray 'Thy kingdom come', though it has come already; every morning we cry the royal messianic salute: 'Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord', though the first Palm Sunday is a thing of the past; every year the liturgy sighs for the coming of the King who has come. The truth is that the combined evidence of the texts shows that the kingdom transcends time and yet it impinges upon history; it 'comes' continuously and unobtrusively but at set times it comes with special pomp.

#### TEXTS FOR PROXIMATE ESCHATOLOGY

With this in mind we shall approach the passages which deal with the kingdom as being soon to come. We have called this 'proximate' eschatology. It is a group of texts on the meaning of which commentators are particularly in disagreement. I hope you will excuse me if I postpone the controversy until after this lecture. I have no doubt that it will follow for I am about to propose the new and provocative views of Father Feuillet of Angers whose book on Eschatology is in course of preparation, but whose ideas are already outlined in recent articles. They have cleared up so many of my own difficulties that I feel it worth while at least to put the outline before you in case it might help you too.

We may take it as certain and undisputed that our Lord does speak at times of the kingdom as if it were still to come. 'There are some standing here who will not taste death till they see the Kingdom of God coming with power'; 'I will not drink of this fruit of the vine till the kingdom of God come', and so on. But the real question is (and the question is only one question): to what aspect of the Kingdom and to what period do such remarks refer? The question arises most acutely in the interpretation of the famous eschatological discourse towards the end of all three Synoptic Gospels, but by way of introduction to this *crux interpretum* we may select a text of Luke (xvii) which, though not contained in the discourse itself, has close affinities with it.

'When shall the kingdom of God come?' asked the Pharisees. The rabbis were much concerned with the question of the date of the son of David's coming and, in the absence of sufficient data from the Old Testament, with the warning signs of its approach—hence the monotonous insistence on a sign from heaven. The question supposes that the kingdom is still to come and it appears probable that our Lord answers it in this sense if, that is to say, we judge by the future *erousi* (shall they say) of v. 21 under the influence of which comes the *ouk erchetai* (cometh not) of v. 20; if, also, we remember that the 'is' of v. 21 may well be 'shall be', since the Aramaic would probably not use the verb. If these remarks are just, our Lord's answer means that the kingdom has a future aspect but its coming will not be heralded in the

sky, i.e. not 'by observation' (*paratērēsis*=normally astronomical observation); rather it will be manifested upon earth in the midst of the Jewish race (*entos humōn*) suddenly and without warning like the lightning of v. 24.

It is possible that many will prefer to explain vv. 20-1 of the present kingdom. In this case it may be pointed out that the audience and perhaps the time and place of v. 22 ff are different, that therefore the aspect under which the kingdom is being considered may have been changed. We are free to interpret v. 22 ff of the kingdom still to come if the text thus invites us. And it does seem to invite us. The natural objection is, of course, that there is no mention of the kingdom in these verses. This enables Lagrange, for instance, to refer all to the last judgement—except vv. 31-3 which he finds troublesome since there is no point in flight at the Last Day. Yet, though there is no express mention of the kingdom, the term 'son of Man' recalls the kingdom of Daniel. The picture our Lord paints is apparently that of the disciples longing for the radiant establishment of the messianic kingdom. The 'day of the son of Man', like the 'day of Yahweh' of the prophets, suggests the great day of messianic intervention and of judgement. The image of lightning, implying not a warning sign (which has been already excluded by v. 20), also suggests the idea of sudden judgement. Lightning is a usual concomitant of divine judgement in the Old Testament but it must be carefully noted that such acts of judgement are many and none of them, of course, final. Thus, for example, in the theophanies of the psalms the lightnings are the arrows of God shot at the enemies of the psalmist. Our Lord, therefore, thinks of a judgement—of a divine intervention and, admittedly, with some *éclat*. Against whom is this judgement directed? It is most natural to suppose that it is the judgement executed upon those in who v. 25 have just rejected the son of Man; that is to say, upon the Jewish nation. Now the lightning of divine judgement struck the Temple and the City forty years after its rejection of Christ. Understood in this way the whole passage gains in clarity. We begin to comprehend the practical instructions of vv. 31-3, useless if the end of the world were the subject of the discourse; moreover, this very advice is applied to the time of the destruction of Jerusalem in Mark xiii and Matt. xxiv, as we shall see. The theory sheds light, too, on the strange verse 37. This is usually interpreted of the disciples of Christ gathering to him at the last judgement. But the image of carcase and vultures is perhaps a little unsuitable in this connection. On the other hand the expression is a commonplace of prophetic and apocalyptic literature to indicate the destruction of wicked nations and cities; it reappears in John's Apocalypse where the word of God judges the beasts (Ap. xix, 17 ff).

*To be concluded.*

A. JONES.

*Upholland College, Wigan, Lancs.*

## WHO GUARANTEES THE BIBLE?

CARDINAL NEWMAN used to say that it was a mortal sin to read the Bible for its literary value. Perhaps he jested, but one can see that from a Catholic point of view he was right in his main idea. The Bible is the inspired word of God and not to be put in the same class with merely human productions. The present Bishop of London, Dr Wand, has recently undertaken to teach his people what to think about the Bible, and it may be worth while comparing what he says with the teaching of the Church. The views he puts forward are no doubt held by large numbers of devout Anglicans and in places show signs of a debt to Papal teaching. Thus one is pleased to notice the echo of Pius XII's *Divino afflante* in the paragraph (p. 11) which the Bishop writes on the kinds of literature in the Bible. 'We should have recognized that, to mention only three types, poetry, history and law belong to three different *genres* of literature; they contain very different kinds of truth and are subject to different canons of interpretation.'

There have been Anglicans, such as the Dean of Wells (R. H. Malden), who rejoiced that their church has never defined what it meant by inspiration. Writing on *The Authority of the New Testament* in 1937, he said: 'Our Church has never attempted to define Inspiration. We may be thought to have come dangerously near doing so in the Ordinal . . .' (p. 8). The Bishop does make the attempt in his sixth chapter, starting from empirical facts, by asking what impression the Bible makes upon its reader, and how that impression differs from that made by ordinary books. This enquiry ends in an assumed general agreement that nobility of thought and beauty of phrase distinguish the Bible from other works. But it is just here that the sceptic will have a difficulty. Is not the beauty seen primarily in the translation which is most familiar to the reader, and in any case, can one honestly say that St Paul's jerky disconnected phrases are more beautiful, *as Greek*, than the finely-chiselled dialogues of Plato? And are the pedigrees of the Patriarchs more ennobling to read than the pages of Cicero's *Somnium Scipionis*? The Bishop takes refuge in the total effect of the Bible, rather than that of single parts or books, but, even allowing that the Bible does make one literary whole for the ordinary reader, he does not seem to have left himself anything to say to the pagan lover of literature who might say to him: 'I find all I want in Vergil and Marcus Aurelius. I cannot stomach the crudities of the Old Testament.' To a disciple of Confucius, of course, the argument from the esthetic superiority of the Bible would make no appeal at all. If the Bible is to be valued because

<sup>1</sup> *The Authority of the Scriptures* by J. W. C. Wand, Bishop of London. (Mowbrays). 1949. 5s. net.

it is the occasion by means of which God speaks to the heart, then everyone will have a different Bible. One lady who was converted from the Jewish faith to Catholicism in recent times has declared that God first spoke to her heart as she was reading Dostoevsky.

No Catholic could rest content with such an empirical approach to a definition of Inspiration. He knows from the teaching of the Church that the Bible is the Word of God, that God is its author, and that men somehow shared with God this work of authorship. Guided by the theologians and in particular by the recent teaching of Pius XII, he would go on from this certain fact to investigate what can be made of this two-fold authorship. How can God be principal author of the Bible, leaving to men their human faculties while using them as His instruments? Here he would come face to face with the mystery of Inspiration—for it is a mystery—and might be helped by the comparison (a comparison which has been adopted by Pius XII in *Divino afflante*, par. 41) of the written Word of God with the Incarnate Word. In all this, the centre of gravity has shifted from the written product to the producer, but Dr Wand himself recognizes that this shift is generally accepted to-day. 'We do not call a writer inspired because he has written an inspired book, but we call a book inspired because it has been written by an inspired writer' (p. 60). It is a pity that he did not make this his starting point for an enquiry into the nature of Inspiration.

The analogy of the Incarnation is helpful in preserving the Catholic from two opposed tendencies in regard to the inspired books. He must not take them to be free from all human defects, any more than Christ was free from the pains, the weariness and the other burdens of human existence. One factor alone stood out from His humanity, the fact of His sinlessness. Just so, there is one characteristic of the written word of God, for all its human nature; it is free from error. From the other side, the tendency to look on Christ as divided, so that one can attribute this act solely to the Son of God and this other to the Carpenter of Nazareth, as if they were two persons, has its counterpart in the treatment of the Bible. Does God supply the ideas and leave the human author to work them out into language of his own choosing? This was a common theological view in the early part of this century, but its pre-supposition, that words and thought are psychologically separable in the human awareness of the writer, has not yet been proved. The Biblical Commission (*Denzinger*, 1998 and 2178) permitted the view that a secretary had taken part in the composition of the Epistle to the Hebrews and certain parts of the Old Testament. This would show, if the secretary himself is not inspired (as many hold), that the final wording was separable from the original inspiration because it was the product of an uninspired mind. But the question of what took place in the mind of the inspired human author would still remain: did he

receive from God imageless thoughts or a thought-content already clothed with some mantle of imagery? Perhaps the best guide here is the experience of the mystics in their visions where, according to St Teresa's testimony in her *Interior Castle*, some imagery remained in her most elevated experiences.

Appealing again to the analogy of the Incarnation for further light on this problem, one might recall that there were divine operations in Christ and also those which theologians call *theandric*, but there was no division of these two powers, just as they were not confounded and mixed into one. How Christ's human will followed the divine will, not resisting nor struggling but subject to the all-powerful divine will, as the Council of Constantinople taught in 681, is a mystery; but one mystery may help to the apprehension of another, and so it is here. The Spirit of God and the human author of a scriptural work are not so closely united that they become one person, as Christ was one person; they remain two, but with such unity that the resulting work has the sureness of knowledge of the Spirit of God while such human foibles as Luke's predilection for Greek words drawn from the Septuagint remain fully operative. What adds to the mystery is that the human author was in some cases conscious that he was being inspired, but in other cases quite unaware that any such stress was upon him. Dr Wand says that this idea of unconscious inspiration is more pagan than Jewish or Christian (p. 59), but there is a difference. The Platonic inspiration was a trance in which the inspired woman spoke in a manner similar to that of a medium at a *séance*, unconscious all the time what she was saying. The Christian idea of making writers the reeds of God is not this, but a process by which God works in and through their faculties without their awareness but also without their loss of consciousness. The Christian writers of the second century use St Paul's word *θεόπνευστος* to describe the process, and it is a word of new minting, not used by pagan writers before this time. (The use of the word by Plutarch, to which Liddell and Scott make reference, is in reality an instance of the word being used by a much later writer, whose work was mistakenly accepted as Plutarch's until recent times.)

Had the Bishop been able to make this distinction between receiving inspiration unawares and going into a trance upon its receipt, he would not have argued that: 'The various authors did not claim for themselves any immunity from common error on the grounds of inspiration. Rather were they content to use the ordinary methods open to every investigator when they wished to make certain of their facts' (p. 58). When Luke was inspired to set about writing his gosepl, God did not so invade his conscious life that he came forth from ecstasy crying: 'Thus saith the Lord'. But none the less surely God had control of Luke's faculties, using circumstances round about him, such as the

enforced inactivity of Luke which was due to Paul's imprisonment at Cæsarea, and no doubt the urging of friends, to get him to start the work, and guiding him while he did it as surely as the angel guided Philip to the eunuch.

One is not surprised, after all this, to find the Bishop saying: 'It was once regarded as necessary to an inspired book that it should be free from every kind of error whether of historical fact or scientific statement', and then going on to conclude: 'The sacred writers enjoyed no gift of infallibility' (pp. 57-60). More distinctions are needed here. No one would claim that the Bible taught physical science or that God put into the minds of Mark or Luke the latest details of atomic theory. But equally, no one would want to say that where God is the author, the work produced can be an untruth. Using the analogy of the Word Incarnate again, one can assert with the Church that what the human authors put forward as true statements in the Bible are true, not merely those which declare dogmatic truths but also those which professedly make assertions about historical facts. It is of course to be remembered that the human characteristics of the writers were respected by divine inspiration, and that such Hebraic mannerisms as the spiral form of narrative (in which a story is gradually unfolded, the same event in it being adverted to several times, each time with an added detail not mentioned before) are not removed by the action of the Holy Spirit. It has also been noted of the Jews that they see everything in extremes, as if their colour vision was confined to blacks and whites and could not take in the greys and the half-tones. Now for a man of such mentality to indicate uncertainty there is no way so natural as to say: 'I know this', and then to add: 'I know it not'. Black and white make up the grey that is required. One has to take the single statement in a wide context to see whether it has been qualified by the writer before he had done with his theme. Admittedly the use of such principles makes the interpretation of the Scriptures harder and not easier; but then, the Church has never claimed that they were easy.

The inequality of inspiration is a subject on which the Church has not pronounced. The Jews had three grades of it for the three categories into which they divided the Old Testament, but no Christian writer save Theodore of Mopsuestia seems to have taken up this idea. Fr Lagrange thought it had been excluded by Trent, but the words of the Council: *Omnes libros . . . pari reverentia suscipit . . .* merely mean that the Bible and Tradition are to be held in like reverence, as the Acts of the Council make abundantly clear. There is no thought of putting each of the books of the Bible on the same level as regards the manner of their inspiration. Dr Wand however, argues from the varying degrees of certainty, which he thinks belong to the different parts of the Bible, to the inequality of their inspiration. 'If all have not the same certitude,



they cannot all have the same inspiration. Once the belief in the equality of inspiration is broken, we are able to recognize that some passages and even some books are more inspired than others . . . This is especially important in any attempt to assess the value of the Apocrypha' (p. 56). Dr Wand seems anxious to justify the place allowed to the Apocrypha (such as I and II Macchabees) by Article VI of the Anglican Church, which declared that they may be read for example of life but not used to establish any doctrine. But if he justifies this separation between books on the ground of a difference of inspiration and allows each man to judge degrees of inspiration, then he will not be able to stop a modern follower of Marcion, who out of hatred of the Jews wishes to throw out the Old Testament and parts of the New and to keep only Luke's gospel and ten epistles of Paul. The only valid test whether a book is inspired is the teaching of the Church that it is (or is not) inspired. Once that criterion is left behind, then subjective choice reigns supreme.

The Bishop gives (pp. 43-6) a very fair account of the origin of the formation of the Anglican canon of the Scriptures and their rejection of books such as Tobias and Judith. 'At the Reformation it was seen that the Apocrypha contained suggestions that were in line with some of the doctrines attacked by the Continental Reformers. This put the Apocrypha out of favour with the followers of reformed views.' The editors of the original Douay version in 1609 said as much, in their preface to Tobias :

'Some thinges in these bookes are so manifest against their opinions that they have no other answer but to reject their authoritie : an old shift, noted and refuted by S. Augustin touching the Booke of Wisdome, which some refuted, pretending it was not canonical, but in deede because it convinced their errors.'

He does, however, omit any discussion of the question whether the Jews of Palestine, in differing from their brethren of Alexandria and in their cutting down the list of inspired books to some twenty-four, were actuated by any motive of opposition to Christianity. Long ago, Herbert Loewe assigned this opposition as the probable cause of the drawing up of the Canon of Jamnia by the Jews after the destruction of the Temple in A.D. 70. Certainly Rabbi Akiba had much to do with it as he had with opposition to Christianity and the narrower Canon appears just at the time when the Jews found it necessary to introduce prayers against the Minim and warnings against heretical writings. That some of their own writings should have been sacrificed in the process may have been due to the wide use made of some of these by Paul and others in controversy with the Jews, or it may come from the fact that the Rabbis at Jamnia drew their line so far back in the past as to exclude from the Canon all the latest in date of Old Testament writings as well as the new Christian gospels, such as that of Matthew, which were beginning to circulate amongst Jews to the detriment of orthodoxy.

The treatment of the Canon of the New Testament is not so good or so accurate. The Bishop has made a slip where he says that the Muratori fragment (which actually quotes the opening of John's first Epistle as being by John) does not include in the Canon the first Epistle of John. He also says that Origen is the first who explicitly regards the writings of the Old Covenant and of the New as being on the same level, but Melito of Sardis, who died before Origen was born, had already spoken in express words of 'the Old Testament', thereby implying that he ranked a New Testament with it as its counterpart. In the fragmentary state of second century evidence, this remark by Melito is all that the most critical could wish for. Doubts about the Apocalypse and the Epistle to the Hebrews are often represented, as here, as arising before these writings had achieved canonical status, but it is certainly the case that Justin accepted the Apocalypse as inspired scripture a century before Denis of Alexandria was minded to put forward his doubts on its position. Indeed the eccentric Turmel regards the Apocalypse as one of the few canonical writings he can allow to the early Church without question. That Hebrews was in similar case may be argued from its prominent position in the Chester Beatty papyrus, where it was found to occupy a place of honour in the Pauline corpus, to the surprise of all the critics.

A passing suggestion made by Dr Wand that the Apocalypse may consist of separate pieces, 'distributed as leaflets by the underground movement in the reign of Nero', recalls the idea cherished by the late Fr Eric Burrows that St John wrote short accounts of his visions on what bits of papyrus he could get in the quarries of Patmos and had these smuggled out to the mainland one at a time as occasion offered. Another remark worth attention is to the effect that modern scholars are afraid to say who the author of the Fourth Gospel was (though the Bishop himself thinks John the Apostle quite a possible candidate). This sentence was presumably written before the publication of the admirable defence of John's authorship by the late Bishop of Gloucester, which he left as a legacy to posterity.

J. H. CREHAN, S.J.

*Heythrop College, Chipping Norton, Oxon.*

## THE KINGDOM OF GOD AND THE CHURCH IN THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS<sup>1</sup>

**I**N the forefront of Christ's preaching is the conception of the kingdom, a highly complex notion which has been variously interpreted. To some it appears as a kingdom not of this world at all: it is either a kingdom which He expected to come in its final and perfected form at the end of His own life—an eschatological kingdom—or a purely spiritual reality established exclusively in the depths of men's hearts without any outward organization. The main fault of these interpretations lies in their exclusiveness, for a careful examination of the concept reveals a richness which extends to both interpretations and far beyond them. The kingdom in its perfection is attained hereafter, and in that sense is eschatological; it is truly spiritual and demands inward loyalty. But it is also realized, however, imperfectly, in this world; and it is realized as a visible organized society, as well as a new and breath-taking allegiance.

It is in St Matthew's Gospel where the expression occurs most frequently<sup>2</sup>; and there it is 'the kingdom of heaven', corresponding to the Jewish custom of refraining from use of God's name, while in Mark and Luke 'the kingdom of God' is used.

The Gospels develop a notion already familiar from the Old Testament, and even there highly complex. He who claimed not to destroy, but to fulfil the law, must have meant to convey in His message about the kingdom something of the authentic meaning it possessed in the Old Testament writings. It was not there, but in the minds of His contemporaries, even of His own disciples, that a narrow nationalist conception had prevailed, with all the stress laid on the external organization and apparatus of ruling. Their final recorded question related to *that* kingdom, and at the very end they looked for a striking triumph over earthly rulers: 'Wilt thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel (Acts i, 6)?' The truer notion was of a kingdom inaugurated by the Messiah in this world, partly through His approach to men's hearts and partly an external, organized body, but perfectly established in heaven at the end of time (cf. Daniel vii, 27; Wisdom iii, 8-9). Before the exile Yahweh was seen as exercising His rule over Israel, afterwards more as the universal king. All these aspects are

<sup>1</sup> This article was originally envisaged as part of a larger work in Apologetics. Unfortunately there was not time to revise it for its present use.

<sup>2</sup> Fifty-one times; 14 in Mark, 31 in Luke. Cf. M. J. Lagrange, O.P.: *L'Evangile selon Saint Matthieu* (Gabalda, Paris, 1923), p. clvi (the principal source, together with Yves de la Brière: art. *Eglise*, in the *Dictionnaire Apologetique de la Foi Catholique*, for this article. For a brief and simple treatment of the subject, see also: Fr Lemmonyer, O.P.: *The Theology of the New Testament*.

included in the ideal of the kingdom as expounded in the synoptics, and Israel's part in preparing the world for the advent of the kingdom is clearly described.

The main division is between the kingdom of the hereafter and that which is manifested in this world. Both are possible meanings of the Greek word *Basileia*; but the distinction is best rendered in English by the use of the term 'realm' or 'kingdom', for the clearly-defined territory where God's rule is perfect, and 'reign', for the imperfect kingdom of this world with its shifting and uncertain territorial extension and where there is never perfect obedience to the law of God. Briefly, there is the eschatological *kingdom*, the land of the hereafter where the just live with God after death, and the *reign* of God, which is the extension of His sovereignty on earth. The distinction is clear, but it is not possible to relate any particular text exclusively to either conception; in the actual utterances of Jesus only the difference in emphasis can be perceived. For 'in His conception, and by virtue of His personal action, the reign of God inaugurated by Him becomes a kingdom on earth . . . The reign of God is a veritable kingdom of God on earth, but much inferior to that of the Father which will receive only the just . . . The kingdom most often is eternal life, prepared from the origin of the world, to which the just will be admitted. But the notion of a territorial kingdom could be applied also to the messianic reign, represented thus as an external society established on earth . . . It would not be wrong to relate this kingdom to the Church of which Peter will be the foundation'.<sup>1</sup>

The majority of the references to the kingdom undoubtedly place the emphasis on the life to come. It is a final reward for 'the poor in spirit' and the persecuted (Matt. v, 3, 10; Luke vi, 20), for the humble and forgiving (Matt. xviii, 3, 23-35), for the child-like (Matt. xix, 14; Mark x, 14-15; Luke xviii, 16-17), for those who keep the law in its fullness and fulfil God's will in reality (Matt. v, 19-20; vii, 21), for those who choose a hard way of chastity (Matt. xix, 12), and in a special way for the disciples (Luke xii, 32). Riches hinder the approach to it (Matt. xix, 23-4; Mark x, 23-5; Luke xviii, 24-5), but a late start does not make any difference to its attainment (Matt. xx, 1-16); nevertheless anything which might stand in the way of gaining the kingdom must be ruthlessly cast out (Mark ix, 46). After a final judgement at which the sheep will be separated from the goats (Matt. xxv, 31-46), the kingdom will appear in its perfection as a social gathering of the just in perfect communion with one another and with God (Matt. viii, 11-12; xiii, 43; xxii, 2-14; xxv, 1-13; xxvi, 29; Mark xiv, 25; Luke xxii, 16-18).

<sup>1</sup> Lagrange: op. cit., pp. clvii, clxii, clx, clxii.

The prelude to that perfect kingdom is in this world, an imperfect but real dominion of God which continues over long ages before the final separation between good and evil is achieved. This reign of God is presented sometimes in a more or less confused manner, with the perspective prolonged into the future life; sometimes it is a grace offered to men now, impelling a fateful decision; at other times it is a genuine kingdom already established on earth.

A kingdom, the outlines of which are indistinct, but which is clearly to be established in the world, is the subject of the preaching of John the Baptist (Matt. iii, 2), and of Jesus' first message as well as of His disciples (Matt. iv, 17, 23; Mark i, 14-15; Matt. ix, 35); it is even imminent, approaching, long before the consummation of the world (Matt. x, 7). We are asked to pray that the kingdom should come, as the context indicates by the fulfilment of God's will on earth 'as it is in heaven' (Matt. vi, 10; Luke xi, 2); a kingdom that *comes* is distinct from the kingdom hereafter, to which we *go*. The sons of Zebedee sought a place in the kingdom which they naturally expected in this world; but the answer need not be wholly a reference to the future life (Matt. xx, 21). The scribe who perceived the primary importance of charity was assured that he was very near to this kingdom (Mark xii, 34).

The kingdom therefore appears also as a proffered grace: 'The reign is there as a divine proposition. It is necessary to decide, to take sides for or against.'<sup>1</sup> Everything else, all material considerations, must be subordinated to the search for the kingdom of God and His justice; that is to say, the dominion of God over men in this world (Matt. vi, 33; Luke xii, 31). The disciples were given a special initiation into its mysteries, to know better than others what the grace implied (Matt. xiii, 11; Mark iv, 11; Luke viii, 10). It has a varied reception (Matt. xiii, 19); it is sometimes found in the midst of evil things and will not appear in its full purity till the end of time (Matt. xiii, 24); it should be regarded as more valuable than all one's worldly wealth, as a treasure and a pearl of great price (Matt. xiii, 44-5). A humble, childlike reception is recommended, so that through the proper response to the kingdom as a proffered grace we may enter the clearly defined kingdom of the hereafter (Mark x, 15).<sup>2</sup>

The acceptance of grace also means entry into a kingdom already present; not merely a 'reign', because outwardly organized and visible;

<sup>1</sup> Lagrange: op. cit., p. cix.

<sup>2</sup> Here the two main uses of the term 'kingdom' are quite clearly distinguished. In the previous verse the present tense is used in reference to a future kingdom, because it has been prepared from all eternity. These verses provide a background for vv. 23-5. M. J. Lagrange, O.P.: *Évangile selon Saint Marc* (Gabalda, Paris, 1911), p. cccxii.

nor merely a kingdom of the future, because existing in the conditions of this life. The pharisees reject grace and even now prevent men from entering the kingdom (Matt. xxiii, 13); the chief priests neglected the grace offered by John the Baptist and therefore the publicans and harlots, who believed his message, will precede them into the kingdom (Matt. xxi, 31); because the Jews have failed, the kingdom will be taken from them and given to a nation which will bear its fruit—'a nation', producing visible effects by reason of belonging to the kingdom, these are clearly the conditions of the present time; the parable of the wedding feast (Matt. xxii, 2-14), though it leads up to a final exclusion from the kingdom of the hereafter, undoubtedly refers to the establishment of a kingdom on earth as an historical fact. The call to its acceptance is now urgent, and those who are most vigorous in their response will successfully gain the kingdom (Matt. xi, 12; Luke xvi, 16). John the Baptist as a precursor is not so great as lesser men who are in the kingdom (Matt. xi, 11), yet he must be equal or greater in the eternal kingdom. The question about degrees in the kingdom (Matt. xviii, 1-5) implies a present institution, especially in view of the parallel passages which only speak of the greater and the lesser in a general way (Mark ix, 32-6; Luke ix, 46-8). It is a kingdom which grows and develops, in time, as a grain of mustard seed (Matt. xiii, 31; Mark iv, 30; Luke xiii, 18) or as leaven (Matt. xiii, 33; Luke xiii, 20-1); it contains good and bad, with great variety of members and of treasure which they can enjoy (Matt. xiii, 38, 47, 52); out of the kingdom (already existing) the angels will gather all scandals at the end of time (Matt. xiii, 41). Calling attention to the power with which He works miracles, Jesus says that the kingdom of God is present among those to whom He speaks (Matt. xii, 28; Luke xi, 20); directly answering the question 'When shall it come?' He claims that it is already present 'within you' (Luke xvii, 21).<sup>1</sup> To some of the twelve He promised that the kingdom would come before their death (Matt. xvi, 28; Mark viii, 39; Luke ix, 27): a text which the eschatologists quote as evidence of our Lord's conviction that He would soon return in triumph, but which can more reasonably be understood as a reference to a veritable but less perfect establishment of the kingdom in this world.

After this general examination of the different uses of the term 'kingdom', the inadequacy of the eschatological theory becomes more obvious. From such texts as this last and Matt. xxiv, 34 ('this generation shall not pass') its exponents argue that the conception of the imminent establishment of the kingdom in triumph was that of our Lord; otherwise the texts would not have been left in the gospels after the writers had perceived them to be contradicted by events. Nevertheless, the

<sup>1</sup> For the meaning of this verse which some have taken as a proof that the kingdom is wholly internal and spiritual, see p. 243.



evangelists corrected them by words of their own, suggesting a different form of kingdom and an outward organization of the Church which grew from their experience—direct or indirect—of our Lord's friendship but which was not part of His original design. This theory is shown to be impossible (i) because based exclusively on an interpretation of the texts in question which is at least not the only possible one; (ii) because the evangelists, notably Matthew, can be shown to represent accurately the mind of Christ; (iii) because these authentic words of Christ relate to a kingdom inaugurated in this world in an imperfect state of preparation for the eternal; (iv) because the whole conception of the kingdom is far grander, richer than this and—however difficult—expresses a real harmony between the different usages of the term.

(i) 'There are some of them that stand here, that shall not taste death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom' (Matt. xvi, 28). These words come at the end of a passage on the necessity of renouncement in order to attain salvation. But they do not necessarily refer to the coming of the Son of man in judgement, already mentioned in v. 27, but seem to introduce a new perspective; to the hesitant they might offer a word of encouragement: to gain the kingdom in the fullest sense, they must renounce all, but they will be comforted at an early date by the inauguration of the kingdom in its relative perfection. Such an interpretation is confirmed by the other texts above-mentioned which could not possibly refer exclusively or even primarily to an eschatological kingdom. 'This generation shall not pass, till all these things be done' (Matt. xxiv, 34), as already explained, is best understood as an answer to one of two distinct questions, namely that which relates to the destruction of Jerusalem. Even if these interpretations were much less solidly based, they would still be sufficiently plausible to render very uncertain a theory *wholly* built up on an interpretation which isolates the texts from all other references to the kingdom.

Other possible views are that the promise refers to the Transfiguration mentioned in the next chapter or to the judgement on Jerusalem vividly shown forth in the destruction of the city in A.D. 70, within the lifetime of some of the disciples.

(ii) According to St Matthew the risen Jesus possessed all power in heaven and on earth, and thus had entered into His kingdom. It is therefore perfectly consistent to speak of a proximate coming in His kingdom. 'It is true that Matthew speaks also of a coming which must be very near to the consummation and even coincide with this last end. But he does not describe it in quite the same manner. At the end, the son of man will come with His angels, in the glory of His Father (xvi, 27), in His own glory with all His angels (xxv, 31), or He will send His angels (xiii, 41). And yet He was present in His kingdom, since He was with His own (xviii, 20 and xxviii, 20). If we really wish

to reconcile these texts, we must say that the first taking possession of the kingdom was followed by a return to heaven which did not prevent a spiritual presence; but we must take great care not to deny the very real inauguration of the reign of which the Gospel has so often spoken. 'It is discreet, manifested to the apostles, to whom henceforward are entrusted the preaching, the recruiting of subjects, the administration of the kingdom (xix, 28) under the direction of Peter (xvi, 18). The manifestation of the final advent, with the angels, will be more solemn, and it is that which Matthew calls the *parousia* (xxiv, 3, 27, 37, 39), thus comparing it to the solemn visits of a sovereign in one of his states.'<sup>1</sup> Moreover, this whole chapter by its juxtaposition of the two events, the destruction of Jerusalem and the final judgement, manifests an origin earlier than A.D. 70, being written in the ignorance which v. 36 proclaims as inevitable.

The careful preparation and training of the apostles, the elaborate organization of the Church, as described in St Matthew's gospel, cannot be reconciled with an early advent of the final kingdom. Yet the references to these things are found in the parables which contain the best of Jesus' teaching and in sayings which bear the clearest signs of time and place (xvi, 18). The critics attribute such texts to the Jewish-Christian spirit: 'Which is a simple admission that they are completely primitive, and precisely the expression which is suitable to the thought of Jesus'.<sup>2</sup> And no matter when the gospel was written, St Paul's efforts to organise the Church are only explicable in an atmosphere where the *ideas* of a permanent and organized community extended to the whole world according to the will of Christ were current. 'In reading Matthew it is possible to misunderstand the harmonious arrangement of the discourses—which is his work, partly no doubt based on the catechesis, but we can hear Jesus speak'.<sup>3</sup>

(iii) As already pointed out, the kingdom is often presented against the background of the present life: it grows and develops, it contains good and evil, its members suffer trials, it is given to the Gentiles, it requires a new code of morality envisaging a long period of observance: 'Such a parallelism (between the Old and the New Law) gives the impression that the New Covenant, as until lately the Old Covenant, must endure in this world for a whole succession of ages'.<sup>4</sup>

(iv) The reign of God in this world, itself a real kingdom, is separated from the eternal kingdom by 'the end' or 'the consummation' (*sunteleia*) of the world' (Matt. xiii, 39, 40, 49; xxviii, 20). The duration of the earthly kingdom is not precisely indicated, but it appears to be very long indeed: It must be long enough to allow for the preaching of the Gospel of the kingdom to all nations, 'and then shall the consummation

<sup>1</sup> Lagrange, *op. cit.*, p. clxvi.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. clxix.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. clxxii.

<sup>4</sup> *Dictionnaire Apologétique*: art. cit., col. 1232.

come' (Matt. xxiv, 14; cf. xxviii, 19); to allow for the leavening (Matt. xiii, 13); to leave an adequate interval between sowing and harvesting—as the reference is to the *cosmos* (Matt. xiii, 38), the literal half-year must be extended to embrace a cosmic work: 'The entire world now enters upon new destinies'.<sup>1</sup>

No narrow definition of the kingdom, therefore, will suffice. It is of the next world, but not merely there; it is a spiritual, inward reality in this world, but it is more than this, for it possesses an external organization. 'In a word, the "kingdom of God" is the whole activity of Divine Providence directing men to their eternal end; it is the whole activity of Jesus Christ the Redeemer; it is the entire epic of salvation.'<sup>2</sup>

What is the relation between the kingdom and the Church? In one sense the two might be identified, and that—to the believing Catholic—the truest and fullest meaning of the Church: the mystical Body of Christ which includes in its membership those who have reached the eternal kingdom, those who have received the kingdom proffered as an internal grace in this life, and those who belong to the visible communion by profession of the same faith and acceptance of the same rule. But as we are here concerned not with the elucidation of faith, but with its rational and historical foundations, we must restrict ourselves to a view of the Church as it appears in history; then it is 'something of the "kingdom"'; it is not the whole "kingdom"'.<sup>3</sup> Or it may be said: 'The reign of God is the programme of Jesus; the Church is the means of carrying it out'.<sup>4</sup>

The Church, therefore, may be identified with the kingdom in its social aspect; and the texts which attribute an external organization to the kingdom are rightly understood to relate to the Church. These alone would exclude the possibility of a merely spiritual kingdom; but in addition to these there is ample evidence that our Lord made His disciples leaders in a visible society, fitted out with all the means necessary to attain its end, and destined to endure to the end of time. It is through the presentation of this evidence that the views of Harnack and Sabatier and their followers can be shown to be inadequate, but one last reference to the kingdom needs to be examined before then:

And being asked by the Pharisees, when the kingdom of God should come, he answered them, and said: The kingdom of God cometh not with observation. Neither shall they say: Behold here, or behold there. For lo, the kingdom of God is within you (Luke xvii, 20-21).

Does 'within you . . . *entos humon*' mean that the kingdom is always, and under all circumstances, purely internal? This could not

<sup>1</sup> Lagrange: op. cit., p. clxvi.

<sup>2</sup> Yves de la Brière: art. cit., col. 1247.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.

<sup>4</sup> A. Tanquerey. *Synopsis Theologiae Dogmaticae*, Vol. I, Paris, 1927, p. 390 n.3.

be, in view of the texts which speak of the social character of the kingdom; nor could it contradict these. The fact was that the pharisees had a worldly conception of the kingdom and expected a prodigy announcing its advent. Jesus answers their question, clearly distinguishing the coming of the kingdom from His own final coming which will be visible and accompanied by striking signs (v. 24), by saying that it is there indeed, perceptible but not strikingly so: the reign of God is inaugurated by the preaching of Christ, is in their midst as a proffered grace and can be in their hearts if they will accept it.

E. QUINN.

## TRENDS IN BIBLICAL INTERPRETATION

### II

**I**N a previous article<sup>1</sup> some consideration was given to recent trends in Biblical interpretation for the most part among non-Catholic writers, and attention was drawn to the renewal of interest in the spiritual or typological sense. The subject was taken up by Catholics both in England and in France early in the recent war. The German occupation of France was followed by a remarkable outburst of intellectual activity on the part of the French, and Biblical study had its place in this. Père de Lubac, S.J., one of the most prolific of modern French Catholic writers, has published remarkable introductions to Origen's Homilies on Genesis and on Exodus. His aim is clearly to correct many impressions about Origen which he considers to be false. In his introduction to the Homilies on Genesis<sup>2</sup> de Lubac sets out to disprove the almost universally-held view that Origen not infrequently denies the existence of the literal sense of Scripture. Origen's intense devotion to Christ made him seek a spiritual sense in all Scripture. If he said there were some episodes purely spiritual from which one cannot get any literal sense, he appears only to have meant that one should take the passage as figurative or metaphorical. In other words he confused the terms 'spiritual' and 'figurative'. Or again, when he said that certain Bible episodes were not histories he seems to have meant that they did really happen, but if they had *only* their literal historical meaning there would be no sufficient reason for their happening at all, and we should be obliged to say they never happened. That is, many events of the OT took place chiefly because they were intended by God to prefigure some mystery of the NT, *op. cit.* p. 51. Origen's

<sup>1</sup> See *SCRIPTURE*, April 1950, p. 175 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Origène, *Homélies sur la Genèse*, in the series: *Sources Chrétiennes*, edited by Pères H. de Lubac and J. Daniélou, S.J.

attempt to interpret the whole of the OT in terms of the New seems to have been the result of its continuous use in the liturgy of the Church. After listening to a reading e.g. from the Book of Numbers, ch. xii, people would ask: What value has this for me? Origen tried to supply an answer. Taken literally, he would say, little or none: but interpreted spiritually it is fruitful. And he went on to interpret the wells, there described, as sources of grace. To the casual observer it certainly looks as if anything can mean anything when Origen deals with it, but we should not overlook the fact which de Lubac strives to underline, that Origen has hold of a profound truth. He views Scripture as a whole: the OT merges into the NT and indeed should as far as possible be interpreted in terms of the New. De Lubac maintains that Origen, without denying the literal sense, always seeks to go beyond it. One passes from history to mystery. This method infuses new life into details otherwise apparently dead. The deeper spiritual meaning of the Old Testament is seen, not by more study but by fulfilment, *Homélies sur l'Exode*, p. 45. Origen nevertheless has a sense of history though admittedly he regards it more as pre-figuring than as preparing. In particular, he uses three methods, (1) Of elucidating the OT by the NT. (2) Elucidating one OT Book by another, and (3) Collecting all the passages where a certain word occurs, irrespective of the wider context, and working out its meaning from them. It is Christ whose coming has made the OT intelligible to us—He has opened the Scriptures for us. If this action of his was necessary to reveal the meaning of the OT, it is no less necessary for us to be converted to Christ if we would discover it, and the understanding of the Scriptures is a gift for which one must prepare oneself, *Hom. sur l'Exode*, p. 68. After explaining the letter of the text one must ask the grace of the Holy Ghost in order to penetrate the mystery. De Lubac admits nevertheless that Origen's own division of senses of Scripture is confusing and artificial, and many of his interpretations devoid of foundation. De Lubac has certainly done a service in bringing the work of Origen once more to the foreground and in dispelling certain misconceptions, though not everyone will follow him all the way in his vindication of the great Alexandrian.

In a remarkable article<sup>1</sup> Père Daniélou underlines the fact that, as Origen teaches, it is the mysteries of Christ rather than the material details of his life which are prefigured in the OT. (The material circumstances are of course foretold as distinct from prefigured.) This is the spiritual exegesis which Origen contrasts with the historical. The whole mystery of Christ is foreshadowed. The typifying of Christ in the mysteries of his life includes the great types such as the Paschal

<sup>1</sup> *Les Divers Sens de l'Ecriture*, in *Ephemerides Lovanienses*, April 1948, pp. 119-126.

Lamb, the Brazen Serpent, and the sign of Jonas the prophet. We have here the typological sense at its most significant level. Indeed Daniélou goes so far as to say that one cannot understand Christ unless one understands the OT, for the description of him in the NT is drawn entirely from the OT. One cannot understand the mystery of the Redemption in all its profundity without knowing something of the Paschal Lamb, the sacrifice of the Covenant, the deliverance of Jonas, *art. cit.*, p. 123. This is what typology does: it comments on the mystery of Christ in terms drawn from the OT. This is what the liturgy and the Fathers do. But Christ in this context is the total Christ. It is the mysteries not only of Christ's life but also of the life of his mystical Body, the sacramental life of the Church which are prefigured. As St Matthew uses and gives the authority of his name to what may be called historical exegesis (fulfilment of the literal, historical sense) so sacramental exegesis is essentially Johannine.

The events of Christ's life related by John are in great part figures of sacraments, as for example the marriage feast of Cana, the multiplication of the loaves, the washing of the feet—for the Eucharist; the discourses with Nicodemus and the Samaritan woman, the miracle at the Pool of Bethesda—for Baptism. But in their turn, these events must be seen against a background of the OT, which is the Exodus from Egypt, with its great 'sacraments'—the Paschal Lamb, the Manna, the water from the rock. Thus the Gospel of St John is a Paschal Catechesis where the Paschal Mystery is unfolded at three levels—figured in the OT, accomplished in the NT, communicated by the Sacraments, pp. 123–4. Origen is a valuable witness to this sacramental exegesis.

But (as de Lubac noted), Origen was speaking to Christians already instructed in the sacraments—and thus his task was principally to deepen their spiritual life. Hence he spent more time on spiritual exegesis than on sacramental. This spiritual exegesis is a legitimate development of typology. Christ indeed can be considered not only in his Person (historical exegesis) or in his Church (sacramental exegesis) but also in the individual soul (spiritual exegesis). Each Christian is a member of Christ who must put on Christ and in whom the mystery of Christ must be accomplished. St Paul employs this method of exegesis when he speaks of the 'azymes of sincerity and truth'. And this is an application in favour among the Fathers, especially those of the School of Alexandria.

Finally, Christ can be considered in his Coming at the end of Time. To this we may give the name of Eschatological exegesis. We have authority for this in Christ's discourse where he himself makes use of the facts of the Flood to describe the end of the world—and in the Apocalypse of St John where the imagery of the Exodus is applied to the events (not now of the sacramental life of the Church, but) of the end of the world. There is an eschatological typology of the Passover,



the Flood, the Fall of Jericho. But it is particularly clearly shown in the symbolism of the Sabbath, figure of the eternal ἀνάπαυσις.<sup>1</sup>

It may be doubted whether this division of senses propounded by Daniélou is really to be preferred to the more traditional division which St Thomas puts forward and which has been in general use since by Catholics. So also may we be slow to accept the suggestion that the typological sense is necessarily Christological in every case, unless we understand 'Christological' in a very general sense, cf. Coppens, *Les Harmonies des Deux Testaments*, p. 88. Yet we should be grateful for the renewed emphasis on the unity of the Testaments.

In a paper entitled 'The Scriptures as Word of God' read at a Conference held at Blackfriars, Oxford, in 1946, and published subsequently in a special number of the *Eastern Churches Quarterly* and also in *Blackfriars*, Dec. 1946, p. 453. Fr Richard Kehoe, O.P., developed the theme that the OT is to be interpreted in the light of the New, if it is still to be for us a living Word of God. So interpreted it contributes to the whole and without it God's message would be incomplete. 'The life of the Church is through assimilation of the whole Bible which is Christ's whole word.' With the coming of Christ the OT is not now obsolete—a collection of proof-texts for the apologist. Christ's word fulfils it—'The glory shines from Christ, but it shines back into the whole of Scripture, making it one glorious body, full of the Holy Spirit'. Thus it is that the spiritual sense of Scripture is established . . . The Scriptures give us the Word of God—Tradition gives us the true sense. By Tradition we mean that instinctive mind of the Church which enables her to handle the Word of God aright. She can unfold all the secrets of Scripture.

Typological exegesis, notes Père Bouyer, an Oratorian, has scarcely been seriously studied in modern times, in consequence of a very understandable reaction against the excesses of patristic and mediæval interpretation—but also because of a certain unconscious rationalism. We are so afraid of indulging in unfounded symbolism that we tend to cut any symbolism to a minimum and admit it only grudgingly. But the fact, he says, is overlooked that—quite apart from the Fathers—the NT is soaked in it. The NT is indeed full of the unity of the two Testaments and this is very largely brought out by means of symbols. This has been fully appreciated by the Church and is developed by the Fathers and above all in the liturgy. A liturgical revival in fact presupposes a Biblical revival, for the liturgy is Biblical from end to end. This Biblical character of the liturgy of course at first arouses no enthusiasm in many hearts because for them Scripture means the Wellhausen theory and

<sup>1</sup> Père Daniélou has followed up this and other articles with a book on the subject which he has named *Sacramentum Futuri* (Paris 1950). His work entitled *Origène, 'le génie du Christianisme'* should also be consulted (Paris 1948).

Lamb, the Brazen Serpent, and the sign of Jonas the prophet. We have here the typological sense at its most significant level. Indeed Daniélou goes so far as to say that one cannot understand Christ unless one understands the OT, for the description of him in the NT is drawn entirely from the OT. One cannot understand the mystery of the Redemption in all its profundity without knowing something of the Paschal Lamb, the sacrifice of the Covenant, the deliverance of Jonas, *art. cit.*, p. 123. This is what typology does: it comments on the mystery of Christ in terms drawn from the OT. This is what the liturgy and the Fathers do. But Christ in this context is the total Christ. It is the mysteries not only of Christ's life but also of the life of his mystical Body, the sacramental life of the Church which are prefigured. As St Matthew uses and gives the authority of his name to what may be called historical exegesis (fulfilment of the literal, historical sense) so sacramental exegesis is essentially Johannine.

The events of Christ's life related by John are in great part figures of sacraments, as for example the marriage feast of Cana, the multiplication of the loaves, the washing of the feet—for the Eucharist; the discourses with Nicodemus and the Samaritan woman, the miracle at the Pool of Bethesda—for Baptism. But in their turn, these events must be seen against a background of the OT, which is the Exodus from Egypt, with its great 'sacraments'—the Paschal Lamb, the Manna, the water from the rock. Thus the Gospel of St John is a Paschal Catechesis where the Paschal Mystery is unfolded at three levels—figured in the OT, accomplished in the NT, communicated by the Sacraments, pp. 123-4. Origen is a valuable witness to this sacramental exegesis.

But (as de Lubac noted), Origen was speaking to Christians already instructed in the sacraments—and thus his task was principally to deepen their spiritual life. Hence he spent more time on spiritual exegesis than on sacramental. This spiritual exegesis is a legitimate development of typology. Christ indeed can be considered not only in his Person (historical exegesis) or in his Church (sacramental exegesis) but also in the individual soul (spiritual exegesis). Each Christian is a member of Christ who must put on Christ and in whom the mystery of Christ must be accomplished. St Paul employs this method of exegesis when he speaks of the 'azymes of sincerity and truth'. And this is an application in favour among the Fathers, especially those of the School of Alexandria.

Finally, Christ can be considered in his Coming at the end of Time. To this we may give the name of Eschatological exegesis. We have authority for this in Christ's discourse where he himself makes use of the facts of the Flood to describe the end of the world—and in the Apocalypse of St John where the imagery of the Exodus is applied to the events (not now of the sacramental life of the Church, but) of the end of the world. There is an eschatological typology of the Passover,

the Flood, the Fall of Jericho. But it is particularly clearly shown in the symbolism of the Sabbath, figure of the eternal ἀνάπαυσις.<sup>1</sup>

It may be doubted whether this division of senses propounded by Daniélou is really to be preferred to the more traditional division which St Thomas puts forward and which has been in general use since by Catholics. So also may we be slow to accept the suggestion that the typological sense is necessarily Christological in every case, unless we understand 'Christological' in a very general sense, cf. Coppens, *Les Harmonies des Deux Testaments*, p. 88. Yet we should be grateful for the renewed emphasis on the unity of the Testaments.

In a paper entitled 'The Scriptures as Word of God' read at a Conference held at Blackfriars, Oxford, in 1946, and published subsequently in a special number of the *Eastern Churches Quarterly* and also in *Blackfriars*, Dec. 1946, p. 453. Fr Richard Kehoe, O.P., developed the theme that the OT is to be interpreted in the light of the New, if it is still to be for us a living Word of God. So interpreted it contributes to the whole and without it God's message would be incomplete. 'The life of the Church is through assimilation of the whole Bible which is Christ's whole word.' With the coming of Christ the OT is not now obsolete—a collection of proof-texts for the apologist. Christ's word fulfils it—'The glory shines from Christ, but it shines back into the whole of Scripture, making it one glorious body, full of the Holy Spirit'. Thus it is that the spiritual sense of Scripture is established . . . The Scriptures give us the Word of God—Tradition gives us the true sense. By Tradition we mean that instinctive mind of the Church which enables her to handle the Word of God aright. She can unfold all the secrets of Scripture.

Typological exegesis, notes Père Bouyer, an Oratorian, has scarcely been seriously studied in modern times, in consequence of a very understandable reaction against the excesses of patristic and mediæval interpretation—but also because of a certain unconscious rationalism. We are so afraid of indulging in unfounded symbolism that we tend to cut any symbolism to a minimum and admit it only grudgingly. But the fact, he says, is overlooked that—quite apart from the Fathers—the NT is soaked in it. The NT is indeed full of the unity of the two Testaments and this is very largely brought out by means of symbols. This has been fully appreciated by the Church and is developed by the Fathers and above all in the liturgy. A liturgical revival in fact presupposes a Biblical revival, for the liturgy is Biblical from end to end. This Biblical character of the liturgy of course at first arouses no enthusiasm in many hearts because for them Scripture means the Wellhausen theory and

<sup>1</sup> Père Daniélou has followed up this and other articles with a book on the subject which he has named *Sacramentum Futuri* (Paris 1950). His work entitled *Origène, 'le génie du Christianisme'* should also be consulted (Paris 1948).

JEDP, or the Synoptic problem and Q. But what we need is an increase, not of critical but of spiritual understanding. Père Bouyer observes that the spiritual exegesis which is supposed in the liturgy is governed by two principles (1) The OT is the Word of God, not a dead word buried in the past but a living word addressed to man to-day; (2) The OT is clarified by the NT and conversely the depth of the NT is brought out when put in contact with the OT. The link between the two is expressed in figure or allegory, cf. Bouyer, *Liturgie et Exégèse*, in *La Maison Dieu*, no. 7.

The main types of the Old Testament are not and never have been in doubt, and clearly nothing but good can come of our study of the Fathers and the liturgy in an attempt to deepen our understanding of them and the mysteries they signify. For it may be conceded that we are less familiar with these types than many in the early centuries of Christianity. Moreover we have lost the habit of using OT imagery to describe NT truths, as is so constantly done in the liturgy, cf. the Holy Week services. A reading of the OT in the light of the more ample revelation of the New, is what, in the opinion of these modern writers, gives life to the OT and makes its reading spiritually profitable. While they agree that there can be no wholesale or uncritical acceptance of mediæval or patristic exegesis, they do maintain that the Fathers and early writers had a certain insight which we have not, or at least have only very imperfectly, i.e. an ability to see Christ in the OT—and this portrayal of Christ is effected largely by means of symbols. It is this sense of symbolism which we must try to recapture.

There are not wanting of course those who insist that so much of patristic and mediæval exegesis is unsound that it is hardly worth while attempting to sift the wheat from the chaff. This attitude however, tends to overlook the fact that much of this sifting has been done and that there are whole granaries of patristic interpretation open to us if we would but use them.

Others perhaps with more reason may object that there is—after all—little more to investigate. The main types are well known to us and it is difficult to pursue the investigation much beyond them because the application of principles becomes so problematical. Should we not confine ourselves to the great types and figures of the OT and content ourselves with noting their significance? To this it is replied: These great types must of course be the basis or framework of any further investigation. It will be noticed that there are certain groups—e.g., Adam and the Garden of Eden; Noah and the Flood; Moses and the Exodus; Joshua and the Conquest of Canaan. These are what one might term organic allegories, or what Hebert calls *Homologies* (cf. *SCRIPTURE*, April 1950, p. 180). Further investigation might take place within the framework, so to speak, of a particular group. Other details,

it is suggested, might be interpreted typologically, to fit in with the main types already familiar. Always of course there is the general norm or guide for our interpretation, known as the Analogy of Faith, which requires us to accept no interpretation which is at variance with the truths of Faith. If such a line of study is pursued we need not of course expect to find any new doctrine. It is rather emphasis and new life which is being sought by those who favour this investigation: 'Thus illumined by the liturgy and patristic tradition, the reading of the Bible will in its turn revivify the smallest liturgical allusions with a great fund of Scriptural experience, pulsating with life', Bouyer, *art. cit.*

R. C. FULLER.

## QUESTION AND ANSWER

*Why does verse 3 of Psalm 2 appear in inverted commas in the New Latin Psalter and in Fr C. Lattey's Westminster Version, as though the words were spoken by the rebels? It seems more obviously to be the decision of the psalmist to break the bonds and cast off the cords of those rulers and kings who resist God. And this is how St Augustine interprets the verse in his second sermon on the Ascension, as given in the second nocturn of the Sunday after that feast: 'Omnes enim quasi quibusdam compedibus nos premunt, et peccatorum nos retibus ligare contendunt; et ideo cum adiutorio Dei, secundum quod ait Psalmista: Dirumpamus vincula eorum . . .'*

The present Holy Father reminds us of the importance of establishing the literal sense of Scripture first. In this Psalm, the nations are subject to Yahweh and his Anointed; but a rebellion is being fomented. The nations are mustering armies with the intention of breaking away from the rule of the Anointed which they regard as no better than bondage. The universal character of the rule here described seems to exclude the possibility that the Anointed might refer to a king of Israel, in particular, David, and there is no discernible reference to contemporary events. The Anointed mentioned in verse 2 is therefore Jesus Christ. As elsewhere in the Psalms, his rule is depicted in very material terms as though he were a temporal ruler. In verse 3 we might expect to read 'his bonds' i.e. imposed by the Anointed of Yahweh. But Israel is conceived as being with the Anointed and sharing with him his rule over the nations. Indeed the Jews of the post-exilic period took it for granted that Israel would dominate the nations in the Messianic age, and even the Apostles after the Resurrection seem to have shared this misconception, Acts i, 6.

Evidence of the Messianic sense is found in the NT. Thus in Acts iv, 25-8, Peter understands it thus ; in Acts xiii, 33, St Paul quotes verse 7 of the Resurrection. Cf. also references to it in the epistle to the Hebrews ; and in the Apocalypse, the language of this psalm is constantly used of the conflict between Christ and his enemies and the eventual triumph of his kingdom. The early Christians understood the 'nations and rulers' to be Herod, Pilate and the Romans.

The speaker in verse 3 cannot be the psalmist. There are no grounds for introducing him in person here as a participant, nor is there anything to suggest that *he* is in bonds imposed by the nations. It would indeed be against the context. Moreover there is a sequence in the speakers—rebels (v. 3), Yahweh (v. 6—not Vulgate) and his Anointed (v. 7)—a sequence which would be mutilated if one adopted the interpretation suggested in the question.

There are those who take this psalm to be literally fulfilled in the historic circumstances of the reign of David or another king of Israel. Such an interpretation would not of course exclude a Messianic interpretation. It would mean simply that the latter would be spiritual instead of literal.

There may well be more than one spiritual meaning in any given text. Whether we hold the Messianic interpretation to be literal or spiritual, we may in either case go on to discuss the possibility of other (spiritual) meanings using the ordinary rules of interpretation. But it is axiomatic that the spiritual sense be based on the literal, and whether you interpret the Anointed as the Messiah or as a king of Israel, the spiritual meaning proposed in the question would be at variance with the literal sense of the psalm. It is difficult to admit that St Augustine intends his use of the psalm in this context to be taken as the inspired meaning of Scripture. Besides bearing no clear relation to its literal meaning, his interpretation cannot be said to enjoy wide support among the Fathers. It seems more probable that St Augustine made use of the words as a simple accommodation of the sacred text to the lesson which he wished to convey.

R. C. FULLER.



## BOOK REVIEWS

*La Sainte Bible: Tome XI, 1ère Partie: Les Actes des Apôtres*, traduits et commentés par J. Renié, S.M. (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1949.)

This commentary, one of the latest to appear in the well-known French series *La Sainte Bible*, is the work of Père Renié, S.M., until recently professor of Sacred Scripture at the Grand Séminaire of Nevers, and author of *Manuel d'Écriture Sainte*, which has passed through many editions in the French and is at present being rendered into English by scholars of the Catholic Biblical Association of America.

The commentary conforms to the general lay-out of the series: introduction, the body of the commentary—each page exhibiting the Latin text of the Vulgate, a French translation from the original Greek, and a commentary underlying—and an alphabetical index.

Speaking generally, Père Renié's treatment is technical and exhaustive to a greater extent than the other commentaries on the New Testament in the series—somewhat of a mixed blessing in a commentary which does not contain the original Greek text. Two-thirds of a lengthy introduction is devoted to critical questions, and pride of place amongst these is given to an elaborate discussion of the Greek text of the Acts—the various 'families' of texts, and the different theories regarding their respective priority and inter-dependence. As a result of his investigations the author adopts as the basis of his translation into French, not any received text, but an eclectic text of his own framing, making use of an elaborate system of signs—inserted in the French translation—to mark the origin or parentage of the readings adopted. It is clear that the absence of the Greek text in these circumstances is a serious drawback for the smooth reading of the work as a whole.

The commentary itself is lengthy and full, a veritable mine of philological, syntactical, historical and archæological information, clear and well-documented, even if a little heavy and slow-moving at times. In our opinion, a little more space might be devoted here and there to religious and doctrinal considerations, in keeping with the general aim of the series, at the expense of the more extensive discussions of an apologetical character and the frequent elaboration of points of syntax and grammar, which latter, we must repeat, seem out of place in the absence of a Greek text. However, these broad considerations must not be allowed to detract from the excellence of the work as a whole and the merit of the breadth of scholarship and very considerable personal thought that have contributed to its composition. Two plans—of the Temple of Herod and of St Paul's Journey's—chronological and dynastic tables, and an exhaustive bibliography add to the interest of the book.

One or two 'errata' have been noticed in respect of references in English: 'sir Kenyon' (pp. 8 and 10) should read, 'Sir Frederic Kenyon';

'The Acts of the Apostles : a Play for an Early Date' (p. 23) should read, 'The Acts of the Apostles : a Plea for an Early Date'.

G. GRAYSTONE, S.M.

*Mount St Mary's, Milltown, Dublin.*

*The Gospel Story* by the Rev. Ronald Cox, C.M., S.T.L., S.S.L. : Vol. I : *Infancy and Galilean Ministry*. (C.Y.M. Publications : Box 2029, Auckland, New Zealand.) Pp. viii + 189. Price in Great Britain, 5s. 3d., postage paid.

On the left-hand page is given the Gospel text in Mgr Knox's translation, with a running explanation on the right-hand page. The idea is a good one, and should be found interesting to the reader ; and the work is helped out with seven illustrations. Other volumes are to appear, but it would be a good thing if the explanations were prepared with greater attention and accuracy ; there are a good many remarks to which reasonable exception may be taken, if only as being too positive. 'The left page is God's inspired Scripture : it contains no error whatever' (p. v). As a matter of fact it contains Mgr Knox's rather free translation of the Latin Vulgate version : even the Greek text itself of the New Testament cannot be discovered with absolute certainty throughout, though the margin of error in scientific editions is a very small one. What was actually inspired was the writing of the original text, not of any subsequent copy or version. It is rather rash, too, to date the events recorded on each page to a single month. It is unlikely that Zachary was praying for a son when he offered incense in the Temple (p. 6) ; he did not even believe the Angel's promise. It is more likely that he was praying for the coming of the Messiah. There is no evidence that our Lady and St Joseph had vowed virginity (p. 8). The presumption surely is that Zachary was deaf (p. 10 ; cf. Luke i, 62). It is not necessary to raise other such points ; nor is what has been here written intended to damp down this praiseworthy enterprise. But it does seem right to suggest more careful study in the preparation of the remaining volumes.

C. LATTEY, S.J.

*Early Christian Baptism and the Creed*. A Study in ante-Nicene Theology by Joseph Crehan, S.J. (Burns Oates and Washbourne, 1950.) Pp. 189. 21s.

The importance of this book has already been deservedly acclaimed among the learned. No future writer on Baptism can afford to ignore either the wealth of material here assembled or the case which it is brought forward to support. It is designedly a specialist work, reeking somewhat of the oil, in which the erudition is frankly displayed, as might be expected from a theological thesis calculated to impress scriptural and patristic experts. The present reviewer is himself among

those who must sit in the back benches at a respectful distance, a little overawed by the apparatus of references to primary sources, variant readings, texts and versions, with seven weighty appendices and four indexes thrown in for good measure. Having found the opening stretches decidedly heavy going, he confesses with shame to hastening incontinently forward to chapter vii—entitled 'Synthesis'—in the hope that here at any rate would be set out a brief and lucid exposition of the author's conclusions. But, no; what we are met with is the fruit of yet further research not very attractively exhibited. The text concludes, after a penultimate paragraph summarizing his findings by Fr Crehan, with a not particularly illuminating extract from Melito of Sardis.

All this is said in justice to prospective readers and is in no sense a disparagement of the author. We have no right to look in a work of this sort for the higher simplicity, the clear vision of the wood as well as the trees, of a Harnack or a Lagrange, whose power of comprehensive and significant statement (the essence of a theological 'synthesis' is the manifest result of a mature and detached mastery of their material. Not that Fr Crehan's central thesis is obscure; whether or not 'Catholics, or believing Christians of any church, have been led by this book to a better realization of the meaning of baptism and the richness of content in its theology', they cannot fail to be impressed by the author's case, presented as it is in 'what must be in the nature of things a piecemeal argument'.

The book consists essentially in 'an attempt to find an answer to the well-known difficulty that, whereas (in Matt. xxviii, 19), Christ told His apostles to baptize with the names of the Trinity, in the Acts they are found to be using a baptism that is 'in the Name of Jesus'. The conclusion to which Fr Crehan would lead us is that, since the authenticity of the Trinitarian baptismal formula cannot rightfully be called in question, it was employed from the beginning and was not subsequently changed. Baptism 'in the Name of Jesus', then, refers to what was demanded of the one to be baptized. He had to confess 'the Name of Jesus'. This act of faith was embodied in a primitive 'Christ Creed', later expanded—possibly under the influence of the Marcionite heresy—into a 'Trinitarian Creed', to take final shape in the second century Baptismal profession of the Apostles' Creed.

What Fr Crehan says of the development of the Creed is, to the present reviewer, more persuasive than his arguments in favour of the unvarying use of the Trinitarian formula; for the two sets of conclusions are not, of course, necessarily inter-dependent. If his thesis wins general acceptance it will prove an important contribution to the positive side of Trinitarian theology. But whatever its fate, we are greatly in the author's debt for having so painstakingly opened up a new mine in the field of ecclesiastical history, in the quarrying of which much precious ore may yet be found.

ALFRED GRAHAM, O.S.B.

*Angelology of the Old Testament*: a study in Biblical Theology, by the Reverend William George Heidt, O.S.B., M.A., S.T.L. (Washington, D.C., The Catholic University of America Press.) Pp. vii-119. 1949. 1 dollar 50 cents.

This work belongs to the series of Studies in Sacred Theology sponsored by the Catholic University of America, and like other monographs in the same series it is a dissertation submitted to the Faculty of Theology. The aim of the work is to synthesize the Old Testament doctrine about the angels, or more precisely the angels of light: the fallen angels being regarded as a topic more suited to a study on demonology.

The book has two main divisions. The first part treats of angels at the heavenly court, the second of angels in the world of men. A third part deals with two special problems, that of the 'Angel of the Lord' in special contexts, and that of the development of Jewish angelology in the period between the Exile and the coming of Christ.

Dr Heidt gives good reasons for his conclusion that the developments in this last age are by no means so great as they are often assumed to be. Even in the Book of Daniel—where angels are much in evidence as speaking in God's name to the prophet—the information about the nature and activities of the angels themselves is meagre.

The question most open to discussion in Old Testament angelology is that of the true interpretation of the words *mal'akh Yahweh*, 'the angel of the Lord'. The author carefully analyses the passages—more than a score in all—where this expression can cause difficulty to the reader of Scripture. To each and every case it is shown that the solution adopted by the author can apply. He adopts, in fact, a reasoned agreement with those scholars who see in the context no reference to any angelic spirit: 'the *mal'akh Yahweh* is the visible or audible phenomenon through which God manifests himself and communicates with the . . . persons concerned'.

C. B. HUGHES, S.J.

*Books and Periodicals Received:*

We acknowledge with thanks the receipt of the following:

G. Mollat, *Les Papes d'Avignon*, Letouzey et Ané, Paris.

H. H. Rowley, *From Joseph to Joshua*, Schweich Lectures (1948) of the British Academy.

J. Dupont, *Les Problèmes du Livre des Actes d'après les travaux récents*, Louvain.

J. Steinmann, *Le Prophète d'Isaïe*, *Lectio Divina*, 5. Editions du Cerf, Paris.

J. Steinmann, *Daniel*, Collection, Témoins de Dieu, Editions du Cerf, Paris.

Vera Barclay, *Darwin is not for Children*. Jenkins.

*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, Washington

*Estudios Bíblicos*, Madrid.

*Cultura Bíblica*, Segovia.

*Verbum Domini*, Rome.

*Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*.

*Collationes Brugenses*.

*Pax*, Prinknash.

*Ruch Biblijny i Liturgiczny*, Cracow.

